

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 8 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Mitsumori (U.S. Pat. No. 6,230,722 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a continuous-treatment apparatus for subjecting a surface of a substrate for a display device, which is targeted for treatments, to continuous plural types of treatments. The apparatus includes a substrate carrier selectively holding the substrate and carrying the substrate along a carrying direction. The apparatus also includes plural types of treatment units which are arranged side by side along the carrying direction of the substrate and which subject the surface, which is targeted for treatments, of the substrate to sequential different treatments at atmospheric pressure or at a pressure near atmospheric pressure. The apparatus also includes an annealing treatment unit disposed outside the plural types of treatment units and downstream from the plural types of treatment units in the carrying direction of the substrate. The annealing treatment unit is larger than each of the plural types of treatment units. After the sequential different treatments, the annealing treatment unit subjects an entire portion of the surface of the substrate, at the same time, to an annealing treatment. Support for the amendments to Claim 1 are found throughout the Specification, including paragraphs [0127], [0128], and Figure 10.

Mitsumori et al. fails to teach or suggest the continuous-treatment apparatus recited by Claim 1. Mitsumori et al. describes wet treatment liquid feed nozzles, including feed nozzles for electrolytic ion water washing, wet treatment liquid feed nozzles for extra pure water rinsing, and wet treatment liquid feed nozzles for drying. Mitsumori et al., Col. 17, Lines 29-45. Mitsumori et al. is silent, however, as to plural types of treatment units which are arranged side by side along the carrying direction of the substrate and which subject the surface, which is targeted for treatments, of the substrate to sequential different treatments, and as to an annealing treatment unit disposed outside the plural types of treatment units and downstream from the plural types of treatment units in the carrying direction of the substrate. Mitsumori et al. is further silent as to an annealing treatment unit that is larger than each of the plural types of treatment units and that, after the sequential different treatments, subjects an entire portion of the surface of the substrate, at the same time, to an annealing treatment. These limitations, in combination with other limitations recited by Claim 1, are not described by Mitsumori et al.

Similar limitations are recited by Claim 6. For at least these reasons, Mitsumori et al. fails to teach or suggest the apparatus and method recited by Claims 1 and 6, respectively. Claim 4 depends from Claim 1, and likewise defines over Mitsumori et al.. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Mitsumori (U.S. Pat. No. 6,230,722 B1) and Goodwin (U.S. Pat. No. 5,324,155). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 2 depends from Claim 1, which defines over the prior art as discussed

in detail above. For at least these reasons, Claim 2 likewise defines over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, 6 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Nakamura (U.S. Pat. No. 6,921,148) and Mitsumori et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,230,722 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Mitsumori et al. is discussed in detail above with respect to Claim 1.

Nakamura et al. describes a plasma processing device with a preliminary heating processing chamber, a first plasma processing chamber, a second plasma processing chamber, a cooling processing chamber, and a transport device. Nakamura et al., Col. 76, Lines 33-41. In a section titled Preliminary Processing, Nakamura et al. describes a crystallization process of laser annealing or a solid growth method. Nakamura et al., Col. 59, Line 60 to Col. 60, Line 7. Nakamura et al. is silent, however, as to plural types of treatment units which are arranged side by side along the carrying direction of the substrate and which subject the surface, which is targeted for treatments, of the substrate to sequential different treatments, and as to an annealing treatment unit disposed outside the plural types of treatment units and downstream from the plural types of treatment units in the carrying direction of the substrate. Nakamura et al. is further silent as to an annealing treatment unit that is larger than each of the plural types of treatment units and that, after the sequential different treatments, subjects an entire portion of the surface of the substrate, at the same time, to an annealing treatment. These limitations, in combination with other limitations recited by Claim 1, are not described by Nakamura et al.

Similar limitations are recited by Claim 6. For at least these reasons, Mitsumori et al. fails to teach or suggest the apparatus and method recited by Claims 1 and 6, respectively. Claims 4 and 8 depend from Claims 1 and 6 respectively, and likewise defines over Mitsumori et al.. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Nakamura et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,921,148), Mitsumori et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,230,722 B1), and Goodwin (U.S. Pat. No. 5,324,155). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 2 depends from Claim 1, which defines over the prior art as discussed in detail above. For at least these reasons, Claim 2 likewise defines over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Cady (U.S. Pat. No. 4,544,446) and Mitsumori (U.S. Pat. No. 6,230,722 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Mitsumori et al. is discussed in detail above with respect to Claim 1.

Cady describes multiple reservoirs of chemicals and/or gas which may be metered or not, and which provide necessary chemicals for chemical processing which takes place in a gap 30. Cady, Col. 7, Lines 50-53, and Figure 1. Cady is silent, however, as to as to plural types of treatment units which are arranged side by side along the carrying direction of the substrate and which subject the surface, which is targeted for treatments, of the substrate to sequential different treatments, and as to an annealing treatment unit disposed outside the plural types of treatment units and downstream from the plural types of treatment units in the carrying direction of the

substrate. Cady is further silent as to an annealing treatment unit that is larger than each of the plural types of treatment units and that, after the sequential different treatments, subjects an entire portion of the surface of the substrate, at the same time, to an annealing treatment. These limitations, in combination with other limitations recited by Claim 1, are not described by Cady.

Similar limitations are recited by Claim 6. For at least these reasons, Mitsumori et al. and Cady fail to teach or suggest the apparatus and method recited by Claims 1 and 6, respectively. Claims 2, 4 and 8 depend from either Claims 1 or 6, and likewise define over Mitsumori et al. and Cady. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 24, 2008

By: / G. Gregory Schivley/
G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGS/BEW/MPD/mmk